

# Re: The Electoral "College" and combinatorics

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2004-08/0108.html>

---

**From:** David C. Ullrich ([ullrich\\_at\\_math.okstate.edu](mailto:ullrich_at_math.okstate.edu))

**Date:** 07/31/04

Date: Sat, 31 Jul 2004 14:35:03 -0500

On 31 Jul 2004 18:41:15 GMT, Bart Goddard <[goddardbe@netscape.net](mailto:goddardbe@netscape.net)> wrote:

>David C. Ullrich wrote:

>

>> 'obviously bad choice' in what sense?

>

>In the sense that he's found to be a plant by the

>Dutch government or a felon.

uh, you missed the part where i pointed out that we don't need the ec to take care of felons...

in any case, the ec has not protected us from getting drunk drivers as president – i imagine dui is not a felony but it certainly seems to me to be the sort of thing that –should– disqualify a person.

is going awol from military service a felony?  
i don't know, but considering that deserters [in a slightly different context] used to be shot it doesn't seem impossible.

>> *this is funny – i considered mentioning the possibility*

>> *that someone could buy off the electoral college*

>> *but decided you might think i was being silly.*

>>

>> *you think it's going to be cheaper to buy a few*

>> *million votes or a few hundred? or [guffaw] you*

>> *think that an elector is going to be immune from*

>> *corruption, because the party bosses wouldn't*

>> *pick bad guys to serve?*

>

>A candidate can *\_legally\_* buy an election of the

>popular vote, by advertizing. He can buy an elector

>only illegally.

really? what federal statute makes it illegal to try to influence an elector's vote? and how do they enforce it? seems like they have to prevent electors from watching tv or reading the paper – i didn't realize they did that.

*>And here, I was just wondering which sort of problem  
>"seemed more likely" (in an expected value sort of way.  
>We might guard against a less likely problem if having  
>that problem was more horrible than having the more  
>likely problem.) To me, it seems more likely and  
>more dangerous to have a legal way of buying the election  
>through TV ads aimed at the majority of idiots, than  
>it is to worry about an elector changing his mind for  
>whatever reason.*

ignoring the question of whether the way things –seem– to –you– has any place in an argument that iirc started with a discussion of whether something is 'logical': what evidence do you have that the typical elector arrives at his opinions for less idiotic reasons than the general public?

*>Bart*

\*\*\*\*\*

David C. Ullrich

sorry about the inelegant formatting – typing one-handed for a few weeks...